



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

November 1, 2011

JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
CHAIRMAN

The Honorable John D. Rockefeller
Chairman
Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation
United States Senate
254 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Rockefeller:

Enclosed, please find the annual Report submitted by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with Section 101 of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 ("NET 911 Act").

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to be "J. Genachowski", is written over the word "Sincerely," and extends across the right side of the page.

Julius Genachowski

Enclosure



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

November 1, 2011

JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison
Ranking Member
Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation
United States Senate
560 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Hutchison:

Enclosed, please find the annual Report submitted by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with Section 101 of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 ("NET 911 Act").

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to be "J. Genachowski", is written over the typed name. The signature is fluid and stylized, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Julius Genachowski

Enclosure



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

November 1, 2011

JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Fred Upton
Chairman
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Chairman Upton:

Enclosed, please find the annual Report submitted by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with Section 101 of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 ("NET 911 Act").

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,



Julius Genachowski

Enclosure



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

November 1, 2011

JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Henry A. Waxman
Ranking Member
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
2322 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Waxman:

Enclosed, please find the annual Report submitted by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with Section 101 of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 ("NET 911 Act").

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to be "J. Genachowski", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is fluid and cursive.

Julius Genachowski

Enclosure

REPORT TO CONGRESS

**ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES**

**Submitted Pursuant to
Public Law No. 110-283**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Julius Genachowski, Chairman**

October 27, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	2
II. Background.....	2
III. Discussion.....	5
A. State Collection of 911/E911 Fees and Charges.....	5
B. State Estimates of Collected 911/E911 Funds for 2010	8
C. Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges To Fund Programs Other Than 911/E911 Services.....	10
D. Indian Tribes	12
IV. Conclusion	12

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report is submitted by the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission (Commission),¹ pursuant to the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (NET 911 Act).² This report, which was prepared by Commission staff,³ is the third annual report on the collection and distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 (E911) fees and charges by the states, the District of Columbia, the U.S. territories, and the Indian territories, covering the period of January 1 to December 31, 2010.

II. BACKGROUND

2. *NET 911 Act.* Section 101 of the NET 911 Act added a new section 6(f)(2) to the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Wireless 911 Act), which provides:

To ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the collection and expenditure of a fee or charge for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services, the Commission shall submit a report within 1 year after the date of enactment of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, and annually thereafter, to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.⁴

3. *2009 Report.* On July 22, 2009, the Commission submitted its first Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges (2009 Report), covering the annual period ending December 31, 2008.⁵ The 2009 Report found that 24 jurisdictions collected

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 155(a) (stating, *inter alia*, that “[i]t shall be [the Chairman’s] duty . . . to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports”).

² New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-283, 122 Stat. 2620 (2008) (NET 911 Act).

³ See 47 C.F.R. § 0.191(k) (providing delegated authority to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to develop responses to legislative inquiries).

⁴ NET 911 Act § 101(2); Wireless 911 Act § 6(f)(2). The NET 911 Act was signed into law on July 23, 2008.

⁵ Federal Communications Commission, Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges (July 22, 2009) (2009 Report).

911/E911 fees at the state level, 11 collected fees at the local level, and 19 states collected fees at both the state and local levels.⁶ Estimates of funds collected ranged from a low of \$1,468,363 in Guam to a high of \$190,239,804.99 in Pennsylvania.⁷ The 2009 Report also found that 30 states, Guam, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico used the funds exclusively for 911/E911 purposes, while 12 states used some portion of their funds to support other programs.⁸ Additionally, seven states were unable to report whether local funds collected in connection with 911/E911 were used exclusively for that program.⁹ Other uses of funds ranged from depositing them into the state's general fund to purchasing public safety radio equipment.¹⁰

4. *2010 Report.* On August 13, 2010, the Commission submitted the second Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges (2010 Report), covering the annual period ending on December 31, 2009.¹¹ The 2010 Report found that 22 jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees at the state level, 11 collected fees at the local level, and 19 collected fees at both the state and local level.¹² Estimates of funds collected ranged from a low of \$6.1 million in Maine to a high of \$203.6 million in Texas.¹³ The 2010 Report found that 32 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands used the funds exclusively for 911/E911 purposes, while 13 states used some portion of their funds to support other programs.¹⁴ In addition, two states did not respond and three states did not provide this information.¹⁵

5. *2011 Information Collection.* To collect the data necessary to compile the 2011 report, the Commission received authorization from the Office of Management Budget (OMB) to implement a data collection program.¹⁶ Following OMB's approval, the Commission's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (Bureau) issued a Public Notice on March 3, 2011, soliciting specific information from state, territorial, and tribal authorities regarding the collection and use of 911/E911 funding in their jurisdictions.¹⁷ The Public Notice sought the following information:

- A statement as to whether or not the state has established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (including a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism).

⁶ *Id.* at ¶¶ 8-10.

⁷ *Id.* at ¶ 12.

⁸ *Id.* at ¶ 13.

⁹ *Id.* at ¶ 15.

¹⁰ *See id.* at Table 4.

¹¹ Federal Communications Commission, Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges (August 13, 2010) (2010 Report).

¹² *Id.* at Table 1.

¹³ *Id.* at Table 3.

¹⁴ *Id.* at ¶ 14.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *See* Letter from Kevin F. Neyland, Deputy Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, to Karen Wheelless, Certifying Official, FCC, OMB Control Number 200812-3060-008 (Jan. 26, 2009).

¹⁷ Information Collection Mandated By the New and Emerging Technologies Improvement Act of 2008, PS Docket No. 09-14, *Public Notice* (PSHSB 2011).

- The amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services, and the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges, for the annual period ending December 31, 2010.
- A statement describing how the funds collected are made available to localities, and whether the state has established written criteria regarding the allowable uses of the collected funds, including the legal citation to such criteria.
- A statement identifying any entity in the state that has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes, and a description of any oversight procedures established to determine that collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism, or otherwise used to implement or support 911 or E911.
- A statement regarding whether all the funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used for the implementation or support of 911 or E911.
- A statement identifying the amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes that were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including a statement identifying the unrelated purposes for which the funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used.
- Any other comments the respondent may wish to provide regarding the applicable funding mechanism for 911 and E911.

6. On March 4, 2011, the Bureau sent letters to the Office of the Governor of each state and territory and the Regional Directors of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) requesting the information sought in the Public Notice. The Bureau also sent copies of the Public Notice to the Secretary of State, Public Utility Commission Chairman, and 911 Director of each state and equivalent offices in the territories. The Public Notice and letters set a due date for submission of information of April 11, 2011. On April 26, 2011, the Bureau sent second notice letters to those states and territories that had not yet replied to the initial request for information. During the week of May 24, 2011, Bureau staff placed telephone calls to states that had not yet responded. On June 21, 2011, the Bureau sent final notice letters to non-responding states and territories requesting information by July 8, 2011. Bureau staff made final outreach calls on July 11, 2011 to non-responding states and territories.

7. The responses that the Bureau received are attached to this report as Appendix B. The Bureau received information from 47 states and the District of Columbia.¹⁸ With respect to the territories, the Bureau received responses from Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands but did not receive responses from Guam or the Northern Mariana Islands. The Bureau received responses from four of twelve BIA offices regarding the status of 911/E911 for Indian tribes.

¹⁸ The Commission did not receive responses from Kansas, New Jersey, or Oklahoma.

III. DISCUSSION

8. Based upon the information gathered from the responding states and territories, this Report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2010, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds. The Report then describes the extent to which states spent the collected 911/E911 funds on programs other than those that support or implement 911/E911 services.

A. State Collection of 911/E911 Fees and Charges

9. States use a variety of methods to collect and distribute 911/E911 fees. Table 1 provides an overview of whether 911/E911 funds are collected by the state (or equivalent jurisdiction), by local jurisdictions, or through a combination of the two.

Table 1

Type of Collection	Number of States
State Collection	21
Local Authority	8
Hybrid	20
No Response	4

10. Twenty states report that they collect statewide E911 fees that are then either distributed to counties or administered directly by the state.¹⁹ Maine, for example, reports that it imposes a statewide surcharge on monthly telephone bills and administers the collection and expenditure of 911 funds within the state.²⁰ The Maine statute granting the state authority to collect and administer 911 funds created an Emergency Services Communications Bureau within the State Public Utility Commission, which implements and manages the 911/E911 system. This system serves the entire state, including Indian tribes within Maine.²¹

11. Eight states allow counties and other local jurisdictions to establish funding mechanisms for 911 and E911 purposes, subject to state statutory requirements.²² Colorado is typical of such states. In Colorado, state statutes authorize local governing bodies to charge fees to support 911 services with certain restrictions.²³ Under the Colorado statutes, local governing bodies impose an emergency telephone charge for emergency telephone services to cover the costs of “equipment, installation, and other directly related costs.”²⁴ Colorado statutes provide for a surcharge of up to seventy cents per month on “wireline, wireless, or VoIP services in which emergency services are provided.”²⁵ Local

¹⁹ This category includes Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Vermont, plus the District of Columbia.

²⁰ See Maine Response at 1-2.

²¹ *Id.* at 2.

²² This category includes Colorado, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

²³ See Colorado Response at 1; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102.

²⁴ See Colorado Response at 1; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 29-11-102(1)(a).

²⁵ Colorado Response at 1.

governments are allowed to petition the state Public Utilities Commission if the local jurisdiction believes a surcharge of more than seventy cents is required.²⁶

12. Twenty states employ a hybrid approach which allows two or more governing bodies or providers to collect surcharges from customers.²⁷ For instance, Illinois reports that it allows local governments to establish “Emergency Telephone System Boards” that set and distribute telephone bill surcharges but also empowers the Illinois Commerce Commission to levy and collect surcharges on wireless subscribers.²⁸ The Illinois Commerce Commission has created two separate funds through its surcharge – one to reimburse wireless carriers for 911 costs and the other to pay for wireless 911 services.²⁹

13. Table 2 indicates whether each state controls the expenditures of funds collected from 911/E911 surcharges. States that responded “no” to this question typically cede control of 911/E911 funds to local jurisdictions. In this table and the tables that follow, states and other entities that did not provide identified information are listed as “DNP.”

Table 2

State	State Approval of Expenditures?
Alabama	Yes
Alaska	No
Arizona	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
California	Yes
Colorado	No
Connecticut	Yes
Delaware	Yes
District of Columbia	Yes
Florida	Yes
Georgia	State oversight for pre-paid. Local control for wireless, wireline, and VoIP.
Guam	DNP
Hawaii	Yes
Idaho	No
Illinois	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Indiana	Yes
Iowa	Yes
Kansas	DNP
Kentucky	State oversight for wireless.

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ This category includes Alabama, Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

²⁸ Illinois Response at 1.

²⁹ *Id.*

State	State Approval of Expenditures?
	Local control for wireline.
Louisiana	No
Maine	Yes
Maryland	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Mississippi	No
Missouri	No
Montana	Yes
Nebraska	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
Nevada	No
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	DNP
New Mexico	Yes
New York	State oversight for state funds. Local oversight for local funds.
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	DNP
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes
Puerto Rico	Yes
Rhode Island	Yes
South Carolina	State oversight for wireless. Local control for wireline.
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	No
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	Yes
Washington	Yes
West Virginia	Yes
Wisconsin	State oversight for wireless; local control for wireline.
Wyoming	No

B. State Estimates of Collected 911/E911 Funds for 2010

14. Table 3 shows the reported amount of money collected by various states, territories, and in a few cases, political subdivisions, for the year ending December 31, 2010. Some states did not provide an estimate of the amount collected. Some states provided separate figures for wireless and wireline services (and, in one case, for VoIP services as well). Some states that collect funds at the state and local levels provided a full breakdown of all such funds, separately identifying state and local-collected funds. Other states that collect funds at the state and local levels only reported state-collected funds. The funds collected ranged from an estimated low of \$3,017,672 in Louisiana to an estimated high of \$199,025,787 in Texas. Last year, fees ranged from an estimated low of \$1,400,000 in Hawaii to an estimated high of \$203,547,359.97 in Texas.

Table 3

State	Funds Collected in 2010
Alabama	State: \$28,680,846
	Local: DNP
Alaska	\$8,649,083
Arizona	\$16,238,766. Interest generated was \$109,587
Arkansas	DNP
California	\$100,000,000 (est.)
Colorado	\$45,000,000 (2008 est.)
Connecticut	\$20,723,228
Delaware	\$8,044,859
District of Columbia	\$12,700,000 (est. that includes FY 2009)
Florida	\$45,888,321
Georgia	Prepaid: \$8,950,569
	Local: DNP
Guam	DNP
Hawaii	Wireline: \$1,200,000
	Wireless: \$8,344,397
Idaho	\$18,013,902
Illinois	Wireline: DNP
	Wireless: \$69,700,000 (excl. Chicago)
Indiana	\$39,600,000 (2009 information)
Iowa	Wireline: \$14,406,862

State	Funds Collected in 2010
	Wireless: \$16,897,515
Kansas	DNP
Kentucky	Wireline: \$27,200,000 (est.)
	Wireless: \$27,700,000 (est.)
Louisiana	\$3,017,672
Maine	\$7,786,855
Maryland	\$54,560,255
Massachusetts	\$75,125,185
Michigan	Counties: \$59,929,592
	State: \$27,744,301
Minnesota	\$58,821,937
Mississippi	\$56,335,986
Missouri	DNP
Montana	\$13,715,064
Nebraska	Wireline: \$8,306,725 (2009 est.)
	Wireless: \$8,128,042
Nevada	DNP
New Hampshire	\$9,832, 831
New Jersey	DNP
New Mexico	\$13,081,062
New York	State: \$193,194,759
	County: DNP
North Carolina	\$80,001,662
North Dakota	\$8,369,366 (2009 est.)
Ohio	\$29,175,929
Oklahoma	DNP
Oregon	\$39,592,560
Pennsylvania	Wireline: \$71,682,316
	Wireless: \$108,538,000
	VoIP: \$14,333,944
Puerto Rico	\$20,952,458 (2008 est.)

State	Funds Collected in 2010
Rhode Island	\$15,488,729
South Carolina	Wireless: \$21,988,052
	Wireline: DNP
South Dakota	\$8,100,000 (2009 est.)
Tennessee	State: \$58,500,000
	Local: No information for 2010. However, estimates for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 are \$43,800,000 and \$43,900,000 respectively.
Texas	\$199,025,787
Utah	Local: \$21,140,368
	State: \$2,769,198
Vermont	\$4,605,803
Virginia	\$53,217,635
Virgin Islands	\$554,245
Washington	County: \$50,888,882
	State: \$20,355,553
West Virginia	\$35,375,580
Wisconsin	DNP
Wyoming	DNP

C. Use of 911/E911 Fees and Charges To Fund Programs Other Than 911/E911 Services

15. The majority of respondents – 39 states plus Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia – indicate that they use collected 911/E911 funds only for 911/E911 purposes. Seven states report that they use or are allowed to use collected funds, at least in part, to support programs other than 911 and E911. Compared to prior years, this represents a reduction in the number of states that have reported using funds for purposes other than 911/E911: in the 2010 Report, thirteen states reported using funds for non-911/E911 purposes, while in the 2009 Report, twelve states reported using funds for non-911/E911 purposes.

16. States that reported that they use 911/E911 funds for other purposes indicated that they use the collected money for a variety of matters, primarily related to other emergency first responder programs. Utah, for example, states that its Automated Geographic Reference Center receives an amount equal to one cent per line levied on telecommunications services to enhance and upgrade statewide digital mapping.³⁰ The one cent is taken from the eight cent per line charge collected by the state.³¹ Four states

(Arizona, Illinois, Oregon, and Rhode Island) report that they used money collected for 911/E911 to assist in closing the state's general fund, although Oregon reports that it used only interest accrued on the collected funds. Illinois reports that it borrowed \$6,665,500 from its Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund but states that under state law, this money must be paid back into the fund within 18 months of the time it was borrowed.³² Illinois also reports that it took \$13,650,000 from its Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund to assist in closing its General Fund.³³ Illinois reports that this money does not need to be paid back, as Section 5h of the Illinois State Finance Act requiring reimbursement of these funds did not become effective until January 11, 2011.³⁴ South Dakota indicates that it cannot provide expenditure information at this time as it is currently reviewing information sent to the State by counties regarding their use of E911 funds.³⁵ However, it notes that the Governor of South Dakota recently signed into law an amendment that clarifies that the use of the 911 surcharge is restricted to the implementation and support of the 911 system.³⁶ Virginia allows wireless E911 funds to be used to support sheriffs' 911 dispatchers.³⁷ West Virginia distributes 911 fees to the State Police and the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management for the expansion of an interoperable radio system and to the Public Service Commission for the expansion of cell towers.³⁸

17. In short, at the state level for the year ending December 31, 2010, most states report that they used collected 911/E911 fees solely to fund 911/E911 services. Many of the remaining states use some 911/E911 fees for related expenses, such as to cover the administrative costs of collecting the fees, or for other public safety purposes (such as public safety radio communications). Table 4 below summarizes the disclosed uses of revenue in the states that reported using 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.

Table 4

State	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Arizona	\$2,463,000 allocated to General Fund to help address state budget crisis.
Illinois	Borrowed \$6,665,500 from its Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund. This money must be paid back into the fund. Took \$13,650,000 from its Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund to assist in closing its General Fund. This money does not need to be paid back, as Section 5h of the Illinois State Finance Act requiring reimbursement of these funds did not become effective until January 11, 2011.
Oregon	Interest accrued went to General Fund.
Rhode Island	Transferred \$10,852,828 to the state's General Fund. This amount represents money collected by Rhode Island that was not specifically appropriated for E911 operation or implementation.

³⁰ Utah Response at 2.

³¹ *Id.*

³² Illinois Response at 6. *See also* 30 ILCS 105/5h.

³³ Illinois Response at 7.

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ South Dakota Response at 5.

³⁶ South Dakota Response at 4.

³⁷ Virginia Response at 3.

³⁸ West Virginia Response at 2.

State	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
South Dakota	Cannot provide this information at this time. The Governor of South Dakota recently signed into law an amendment that clarifies that the use of the 911 surcharge is restricted to the implementation and support of the 911 system.
Virginia	Current biennial budget allows wireless E911 funds to be used to support sheriffs' 911 dispatchers. The state's budget provides that \$8M will be transferred each year from the Wireless E911 Fund to the Compensation Board for this purpose. Although support of sheriffs' 911 dispatchers is not specifically mentioned in the funding mechanism, the purpose is directly related to supporting E911.
West Virginia	\$1,169,639 distributed to WV State Police. \$1,769,391 distributed to Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management to be used to expand the state's interoperable radio system. \$1,000,000 distributed to the Public Service Commission to expand cell towers. Remainder of funds distributed to counties.

D. Indian Tribes

18. Because of a low response rate among BIA offices, and because many BIA offices do not collect information regarding 911/E911 funding among Indian tribes, the Commission does not have a clear picture of Indian tribe use of 911/E911 funds. The Commission requested information from the twelve (12) regional BIA offices.³⁹ Only four offices responded, and only the BIA offices for the Eastern Region and the Great Plains Region indicated that they collected information on 911/E911 funding.

19. The Eastern Region BIA Office indicates that no tribe within its jurisdiction has established a funding mechanism for 911/E911.⁴⁰ The Great Plains Region BIA Office indicates that state and local authorities manage the 911 systems for the Indian tribes within its district.⁴¹ Thus, Indian tribes within its jurisdiction collect no 911/E911 funds. Finally, Maine reports that its state system serves the Indian tribes within Maine.⁴²

IV. CONCLUSION

20. The Commission is pleased to have the opportunity to report on the issue of 911 fee collection and distribution. In this report, we have been able to report on the practices of almost every state and territory. Reported information indicates that in 2010, most of the 911/E911 fees collected by the states were in fact used to fund 911/E911 services, and only seven states that responded to the Commission's data collection reported using, or potentially using, 911 fees to support other activities.

³⁹ The BIA has twelve regional offices, organized by geographic location: Alaska Region, Eastern Oklahoma Region, Eastern Region, Southern Plains Region, Great Plains Region, Midwest Region, Navajo Region, Northwest Region, Pacific Region, Rocky Mountain Region, Southwest Region, and Western Region.

⁴⁰ BIA Eastern Regional Office Response at 1.

⁴¹ BIA Great Plains Regional Office Response at 1.

⁴² Maine Response at 2.

APPENDIX A

Summary of State Responses

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Alabama	Hybrid	Yes	State: \$28,680,846	N/A
			Local: DNP	
Alaska	Hybrid	No	\$8,649,083	N/A
Arizona	State	Yes	\$16,238,766	Yes
Arkansas	State	Yes	DNP	N/A
California	State	Yes	\$100,000,000 (est.)	N/A
Colorado	Local	No	\$45,000,000.00 (2008 est.)	N/A
Connecticut	State	Yes	\$20,723,228	N/A
Delaware	State	Yes	\$8,044,859	N/A
District of Columbia	State	Yes	\$12,700,000 (est. that includes FY 2009)	N/A
Florida	State	Yes	\$45,888,321	N/A
Georgia	Hybrid	State oversight for pre-paid; local control for wireless, wireline, and VoIP.	Prepaid: \$8,950,569	N/A
			Local: DNP	
Guam	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Hawaii	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$1,200,000	N/A
			Wireless: \$8,344,397	

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Idaho	Local	No	\$18,013,902	N/A
Illinois	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; Local control for wireline	Wireline: DNP	Yes
			Wireless: \$69,700,000 (excl. Chicago)	
Indiana	Hybrid	Yes	\$39,600,000 (2009 est.)	N/A
Iowa	Hybrid	Yes	Wireline: \$14,406,862	N/A
			Wireless: \$16,897,515	
Kansas	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Kentucky	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; local control for wireline	Wireline: \$27,200,000 (est.)	N/A
			Wireless: \$27,700,000 (est.)	
Louisiana	Local	No	\$3,017,672	N/A
Maine	State	Yes	\$7,786,855	N/A
Maryland	Hybrid	Yes	\$54,560,255	N/A
Massachusetts	State	Yes	\$75,125,185	N/A
Michigan	Hybrid	Yes	Counties: \$59,929,592	N/A
			State: \$27,744,301	

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Minnesota	State	Yes	\$58,821,937	N/A
Mississippi	Local	No	\$56,335,986	N/A
Missouri	Hybrid	No	DNP	N/A
Montana	State	Yes	\$13,715,064	N/A
Nebraska	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; local control for wireline	Wireline: \$8,306,725 (2009 est.)	N/A
			Wireless: \$8,128,042	
Nevada	Local	No	DNP	DNP
New Hampshire	State	Yes	\$9,823,831	N/A
New Jersey	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
New Mexico	State	Yes	\$13,081,062	N/A
New York	Hybrid	State oversight for state funds; local oversight for local funds	State: \$193,194,759	N/A
			County: DNP	
North Carolina	State	Yes	\$80,001,662	N/A
North Dakota	Local	Yes	\$8,369,366 (2009 est.)	N/A
Ohio	State	Yes	\$29,175,929	N/A

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Oklahoma	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Oregon	State	Yes	\$39,592,560	Yes
Pennsylvania	State	Yes	Wireline: \$71,682,316	N/A
			Wireless: \$108,538,000	
			VoIP: \$14,333,944	
Puerto Rico	State	Yes	\$20,952,458	N/A
Rhode Island	State	Yes	\$15,488,729	Yes
South Carolina	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; local control for wireline.	Wireless: \$21,988,052	N/A
			Wireline: DNP	
South Dakota	Local	Yes	\$8,100,000 (2009 est.)	Yes
Tennessee	State	Yes	State: \$58,500,000	N/A
			Local: No information for 2010. However, estimates for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 are \$43,800,000 and \$43,900,000 respectively.	
Texas	Hybrid	Yes	\$199,025,787	N/A

State/Territory	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures	Funds Collected	Use of 911/E911 Fees/Charges for Other Purposes
Utah	Hybrid	No	Local: \$21,140,368	N/A
			State: \$2,769,198	
Vermont	State	Yes	\$4,605,803	N/A
Virginia	Hybrid	Yes	\$53,217,635	Yes
Washington	Hybrid	Yes	Counties: \$50,888,882	N/A
			State: \$20,355,553	
West Virginia	Hybrid	Yes	\$35,375,580	Yes
Wisconsin	Hybrid	State oversight for wireless; local control for wireline	DNP	N/A
Wyoming	Local	No	DNP	N/A